



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/187,472	11/06/1998	ROGER A. ALLINGTON	17990-1-1	3109

7590 07/22/2005

J GEORG SEKA  
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
8TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
----------

BECKER, DREW E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/187,472

Applicant(s)

ALLINGTON ET AL.

Examiner

Drew E. Becker

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 82-111 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 82-111 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on June 13, 2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The new rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 111 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1761

4. Claim 111 recites "it". It is not clear what "it" is.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 102-103 and 109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi [Pat. No. 4,849,625] in view of Tidland [Pat. No. 5,958,494].

Camerini Porzi teaches a method of roasting coffee beans comprising a photoemitter element (Figure 1, 1), a photodetector for monitoring the color of the beans during roasting (Figure 1, 2), a colorimeter which produces an output signal equivalent to desired color (Figure 1, 7; column 4, line 17), and a comparator which ends the roasting when the signals from the colorimeter and photodetector are equal (column 4, lines 22-26). Camerini Porzi does not recite removing pollutants from the exhaust air, and emitting the exhaust air into a room, for instance a supermarket, reheating and recirculating a major portion of the air, discharging a minor portion of the air, and monitoring a second parameter such the air temperature or pressure. Tidland teaches a method of roasting coffee beans including exhausting reconditioned air into the surrounding room of a retail store where the roaster is placed (column 2, lines 18-44;

Art Unit: 1761

column 8, lines 5-17), reheating and recirculating a major portion of the air while discharging a minor portion of the air (abstract; column 5, line 44), and monitoring a second parameter such the air pressure (column 6, lines 45-70). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the in-room exhaust of Tidland into the invention of Camerini Porzi, since both are directed to methods of roasting coffee, since Camerini Porzi would naturally require a means for exhausting air but simply did not describe it, and since the air reconditioning system of Tidland would have eliminated the need for outside venting of the exhaust gas (column 2, lines 18-44; column 8, lines 5-17). Although not specifically recited, the desired color or darkness level of Camerini Porzi would inherently possess a desired aroma since both are properties of fully roasted coffee beans.

7. Claims 82-85, 108, and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi, in view of Tidland, and further in view of de Vries [Pat. No. 4,284,609].

Camerini Porzi and Tidland teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi and Tidland do not recite cooling the gas to less than 115°F. De Vries teaches a method cleaning exhaust air from a coffee roaster (column 1, line 28) by removing pollutants from the exhaust air (column 6, line 11) and cooling the exhaust air to 110°F (column 8, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the exhaust cooling of de Vries into the invention of Camerini Porzi, in view of Tidland, since all are directed to methods of roasting coffee, since Tidland already included an exhaust system that vented into the surrounding room of a store (column 8, lines 5-17), and

Art Unit: 1761

since the cooling of de Vries would have provided an efficient and convenient means of treating the exhaust air without polluting the surrounding environment with excess heat.

8. Claims 94-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi in view of de Vries and Tidland.

Camerini Porzi teaches a method of roasting coffee beans comprising a photoemitter element (Figure 1, 1), a photodetector for monitoring the color of the beans during roasting (Figure 1, 2), a colorimeter which produces an output signal equivalent to desired color (Figure 1, 7; column 4, line 17), and a comparator which ends the roasting when the signals from the colorimeter and photodetector are equal (column 4, lines 22-26). Camerini Porzi does not recite removing pollutants in a filtration system, cooling a portion to less than 115°F, and exhausting it into the room without recirculating it. De Vries teaches a method cleaning exhaust air from a coffee roaster without recycling it (column 1, line 28) by removing pollutants from the exhaust air (column 6, line 11) and cooling the exhaust air to 110°F (column 8, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the exhaust cooling and cleaning of de Vries into the invention of Camerini Porzi since all both directed to methods of roasting coffee, since Camerini Porzi would have required some means for exhaust but simply did not mention any specific structure, and since the cooling and cleaning of de Vries would have provided an efficient and convenient means of treating the exhaust air without polluting the surrounding environment with excess heat and particulates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the in-room exhaust of Tidland into the invention of Camerini Porzi, in view of de Vries, since all are directed to

Art Unit: 1761

methods of roasting coffee, since de Vries already included means for exhausting cooled and cleaned gas (column 6, line 11; column 8, line 5), and since the air reconditioning system of Tidland would have eliminated the need for outside venting of the exhaust gas thus permitting the roaster to be placed in a retail store for easier customer access (column 2, lines 18-44; column 8, lines 5-17). Although not specifically recited, the desired color or darkness level of Camerini Porzi would inherently possess a desired aroma since both are properties of fully roasted coffee beans.

9. Claims 86-87 and 98-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi, in view of Tidland and de Vries, as applied above, and further in view of Grubbs et al [Pat. No. 4,110,485].

Camerini Porzi, de Vries, and Tidland teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi, de Vries, and Tidland do not teach the use of a laser beam with a wavelength of 600-800 nm. Grubbs et al teach a method of evaluating coffee bean color comprising the use of a helium-neon gas laser with a wavelength of 632.8nm (column 7, lines 41-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the laser of Grubbs et al into the invention of Camerini Porzi, in view of Tidland and de Vries, since all are directed to methods of roasting, since Camerini Porzi already included color evaluation of coffee beans by use of light beams, and since Grubbs et al teach that the laser light source has only a single wavelength and therefor is simpler to calibrate (column 8, lines 30-36).

Art Unit: 1761

10. Claims 104-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi, in view of Tidland, as applied above, and further in view of Grubbs et al [Pat. No. 4,110,485].

Camerini Porzi and Tidland teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi and Tidland do not teach the use of a laser beam with a wavelength of 600-800 nm. Grubbs et al teach a method of evaluating coffee bean color comprising the use of a helium-neon gas laser with a wavelength of 632.8nm (column 7, lines 41-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the laser of Grubbs et al into the invention of Camerini Porzi, in view of Tidland, since all are directed to methods of roasting, since Camerini Porzi already included color evaluation of coffee beans by use of light beams, and since Grubbs et al teach that the laser light source has only a single wavelength and therefor is simpler to calibrate (column 8, lines 30-36).

11. Claims 88-89 and 106-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi, in view of de Vries and Tidland, as applied above, and further in view of Gell Jr [Pat. No. 4,494,314].

Camerini Porzi, de Vries, and Tidland teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi, de Vries, and Tidland do not teach a multiplicity of different product types and roasting levels. Gell Jr teaches a coffee roaster with settings for multiple types of beans and roasting levels (column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the multiple setting and roasting levels of Gell Jr into the invention of Camerini Porzi, in view of Tidland and de Vries, since all are directed to methods of roasting coffee beans, since Gell Jr teaches that coffee beans



Art Unit: 1761

come in different sizes and densities which can effect the roasting time (column 5, line 10), and since Camerini Porzi is primarily directed to controlling the roasting time of coffee beans by monitoring their color (column 1, lines 8-16).

12. Claims 90 and 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0040823 in view of Tidland and de Vries.

EP 0040823 teach a method for controlling a coffee roaster comprising roasting a sample of coffee beans to provide a degree of doneness (Figure 1, P'), a color measuring devices which respond to the color of roasting coffee beans and sample (Figure 1, A & F), a comparison circuit (Figure 1, #14), and ending roasting when the two signals correspond (paragraphs 2-3). EP 0040823 does not teach removing pollutants from the exhaust air, cooling the exhaust air to 115°F or less, and emitting the exhaust air into a room. Tidland teaches a method of roasting coffee beans including exhausting reconditioned air into the surrounding room of a retail store where the roaster is placed (column 2, lines 18-44; column 8, lines 5-17), reheating and recirculating a major portion of the air while discharging a minor portion of the air (abstract; column 5, line 44), and monitoring a second parameter such the air pressure (column 6, lines 45-70). De Vries teaches a method for cleaning exhaust air from a coffee roaster (column 1, line 28) by removing pollutants from the exhaust air (column 6, line 11) and cooling the exhaust air to 110°F (column 8, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the exhaust cleaning of Tidland into the invention of EP 0040823 since both are directed to methods of roasting coffee, since EP 0040823 would naturally require a means for exhausting air, and since the

Art Unit: 1761

cleaning and cooling of de Vries would have provided an efficient and convenient means of treating the exhaust air without polluting the surrounding environment with excess heat and particulates. Although not specifically recited, the desired color or darkness level of EP 0040823 would inherently possess a desired aroma since both are properties of fully roasted coffee beans.

13. Claims 91 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi in view of de Vries, Tidland, and Grubbs et al as applied above, and further in view of Scher et al [Pat. No. 5,062,066].

Camerini Porzi, Tidland, Grubbs et al, and de Vries teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi, Tidland, Grubbs et al, and de Vries do not teach controlling multiple roasting machines at different locations. Scher et al teach a control system for roasting comprising multiple roasters (column 3, line 15) and monitoring the color of the product (column 5, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to control multiple roasters as taught by Scher et al with the invention of Camerini Porzi since both are directed to methods of roasting, since the multiple roasters of Scher et al would have created more diversified products and reduced the waiting time, and since Camerini Porzi teaches a remote processing unit which is located a distance away from the roaster (column 3, line 63).

14. Claim 92 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi in view of Tidland, Grubbs et al, Scher et al, and de Vries as applied above, and further in view of Helbling [Pat. No. 5,158,793].

Art Unit: 1761

Camerini Porzi, Tidland, Grubbs et al, de Vries, and Scher et al teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi, Tidland, Grubbs et al, de Vries, and Scher et al do not teach a step of keeping an inventory and generating a low inventory signal. Helbling teaches a method of making coffee including a weight sensor which detects when a station is empty and generates an "empty" signal (column 7, line 54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the weight control system of Helbling into the invention of Camerini Porzi since both are directed to methods of coffee production and since this would be an effective means of maintaining a constant rate of roasting in Camerini Porzi by eliminating any stoppages in the process due to an empty supply bin. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Camerini Porzi, WO 96/35335A1, Grubbs et al, Scher et al, de Vries, and Helbling since they are all directed to methods of roasting coffee.

15. Claim 93 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi in view of Tidland, Grubbs et al, Scher et al, and de Vries as applied above, and further in view of Gell Jr.

Camerini Porzi, Tidland, Grubbs et al, Scher et al, and de Vries teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi, de Vries, Grubbs et al, Scher et al, and Tidland do not teach a multiplicity of different product types and roasting levels. Gell Jr teaches a coffee roaster with settings for multiple types of beans and roasting levels (column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the multiple setting and roasting levels of Gell Jr into the invention of Camerini Porzi since both are directed to methods of roasting coffee beans, since Gell

Art Unit: 1761

Jr teaches that coffee beans come in different sizes and densities which can effect the roasting time (column 5, line 10), and since Camerini Porzi is primarily directed to controlling the roasting time of coffee beans by monitoring their color (column 1, lines 8-16).

16. Claims 100-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camerini Porzi, in view of de Vries, Tidland, and Grubbs et al, as applied above, and further in view of Gell Jr.

Camerini Porzi, Tidland, Grubbs et al, and de Vries teach the above mentioned concepts. Camerini Porzi, de Vries, Grubbs et al, and Tidland do not teach a multiplicity of different product types and roasting levels. Gell Jr teaches a coffee roaster with settings for multiple types of beans and roasting levels (column 4, line 61 to column 5, line 19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the multiple setting and roasting levels of Gell Jr into the invention of Camerini Porzi since both are directed to methods of roasting coffee beans, since Gell Jr teaches that coffee beans come in different sizes and densities which can effect the roasting time (column 5, line 10), and since Camerini Porzi is primarily directed to controlling the roasting time of coffee beans by monitoring their color (column 1, lines 8-16).

### ***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 82-111 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1761


Regarding claim 91, any group of roasters would inherently be located at "geographically separate locations" since the roasters cannot be placed in exactly the same location. Simply placing the roasters side-by-side would satisfy the limitation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E. Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Drew E Becker  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1761

  
DREW BECKER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
7-21-05